**Post:**

I will compare 8e6 and Lightspeed. My district uses 8e6 which is provided by the Service Center. Since we share its use with other districts the cost is very small in comparison to purchasing the filtering for just our district. I manage our filtering system so I am very familiar with the 8e6 console. I did a Lightspeed demo about a month ago and was very impressed with the ease of managing its console. The 8e6 console is a little bit confusing to manage compared to Lightspeed. It does a great job of customizing the filtering for different groups. Students have a more restricted filter while faculty has more freedom. Most faculty are given an override code that allows them to override the filter. The same ability to customize is available from Lightspeed. Lightspeed accommodates Web 2.0. If purchasing the system, Lightspeed is a little less expensive.  
  
I have mixed feelings about filtering content for learning. I see the need to protect our students from obscene and damaging material, but filtering system are imperfect and they can and do filter out a lot of very good content. I would like to see less filtering and more supervision, especially among high school students. With today's network management software it is very easy to monitor computer use to see if students or staff are miss using the Internet. I think I would prefer more monitoring and less filtering.   
  
<http://www.lightspeedsystems.com/products/Lightspeed-Suite.aspx>   
  
<http://www.8e6security.com/Think-Smart.asp>

**Responses:**

I agree Jack. Last year I was able to access frontline.com and watched full length hour long educational videos for current event purposes. Due to filtering I was unable to access the site at all this year. I can't even watch cnn or fox news videos. It would be a challenge to surpervise a group of kids on the computers all at one time because I know how things happen so fast however, I would like to see less filtering.

Jack, supervision is not always effective. Students close what they are working on when the teacher approaches the desk, then resume their quests once the teacher has moved on to another computer or is helping a student. I constantly walk around my classroom to see what students are accessing. And I still have students on inappropriate sites! Monitoring would be much more effective, for me at least, if I could see what students are accessing from my desktop computer. Then, they would be aware that I can see everything that they can see. Even more effective would be the ability to control their computers and send them messages. We used to have this type of system in place. The powers that be thought that it was a waste of resources. It was not, because we could control what was accessed with the touch of our fingers. Filtering is important, but teachers having control of computers in their classrooms would also deter students accessing inappropriate sites. It would be hard to downplay the importance of filtering; more of it or less of it, it is still important on our campuses and even at the university level.

Jack,   
You have hit the nail on the head Sir. First thank you for the clarifcation and comparison between the two systems.   
Secondly, my point was to say that not only better supervision but also proper internet use "etiquette" and search engine education is key but taught early and improved upon as the students advance from elementary to middle to high school grades we add a little more to the lessons and then monitor that use. Again you are right that we do have the technology to put the brakes on "user profiles" in most computer labs but the break down there has been in my experience; only one or two people on campus know how to work that system or have the authorization. I feel each teacher usiing computers and the library computers should be able to filter someone if improperly using the internet.